

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—That is the reason given in Parliament by the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Railways and Canals, when the money was voted. Then the hon. gentleman criticises an omission from the Speech. He thought that something should be said about the notice which has been given for the termination of the Washington Treaty. It so happens that the official notification for the termination of the treaty only reached this Government to-day. If I had spoken yesterday I should have said that we had not received notice.

HON. MR. SCOTT—Have you the date of the notice?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I have the date of the Foreign Office, it is dated the 19th December.

HON. MR. SCOTT—What is the date of the notice?

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—Last August, but they did not communicate it to the Imperial Government until November, and the Imperial Government communicated it to us in December. The despatch has been received to-day, so at all events no time has been lost by us. It was impossible for us to inform the House of our conclusion on a subject of which we had no official notice.

I do not know whether my hon. friend was correct in supposing that the portion of the treaty relating to the bounding system goes with the portion relating to the fisheries.

HON. MR. SCOTT—It was one of the provisions of the Washington Treaty. It had been in force before, but it was revived by that Treaty. One will fall with the other.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—I apprehend that is the case, but I do not know it. At all events, the explanation I have given to the House will satisfy them that we were not guilty of any remissness for the non-mention of that notice in the speech from the Throne.

I do not know that I need detain the House longer. I am very glad to recognize and thank the House on the part of the Government for the manner in which the speech has been received by hon. gentlemen. We believe—though I am sure the

hon. gentleman from Ottawa will not acknowledge it—that the Government is being carried on in such a way as to promote the prosperity of the country, and that we are doing all that can be done to maintain that prosperity which he recognizes although he says no part of it is attributable to us.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—My intention was not to take part in this debate, but I regret that the stand taken by the Hon. Minister of Justice forces me to do so.

HON. SIR ALEX. CAMPBELL—If the hon. member means my failure to reply to the speech of the hon. member from Repentigny, I may say that I did intend to refer to it, but my voice was rapidly failing me. My hon. friend referred to speeches which I made in this House, in which I expressed my regret that the French element was not represented on the Treasury benches here. I can only say that I regret it now, but it is not in my power to prevent it. It rests with the representatives of the Province of Quebec. I can only repeat what I said in former sessions on the subject, and express a hope that a remedy may be found.

HON. MR. BELLEROSE—At each session, in years past I heard complaints from members representing the different Provinces of the Dominion, and I must say that they were always courteously attended to, even when their grievances could not be redressed; but the hon. Minister of Justice has not thought proper to pursue that course on this occasion. True, he has referred to the complaint of the hon. member from Repentigny (Mr. Armand), since I rose to address the House, but he is rather late. I remember many occasions in the past, when votes were needed in either House, how the French members were courted; but it so happens that to-day the circumstances are not pressing. The Government is not in need of votes now, and since the Premier is now working, as best he can, to do without Quebec. He employs all the means he can to secure the Irish vote. If he can win back those who have deserted him, he may do without the Province of Quebec, but if the Irish will look at his